Application Serial No. 10/673,716

Filing Date: September 29, 2003

Docket No. 0830

Page 9 of 10

REMARKS

Prior to the present amendment, claims 1-53 were pending and claims 54-265

were withdrawn for being directed to a non-elected invention. By this amendment, claim

1 has been amended and claims 54-265 have been cancelled without prejudice or

disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-53 are currently under examination.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C 103(a)

On page 3 of the office action, claims 1-13, 18-20, 24, 28, 35, 38 and 41-51 were

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.

6,130,098 to Handique et al. Further, on page 6 of the office action, claims 14-17, 21-23,

25-34, 36-37, 39-40, and 52-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for allegedly being

anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,130,098 to Handique et al.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to now require that the manipulator be devoid

of micro-channels that limit movement of the fluid to a predefined route. Accordingly,

activation of the thermal elements alone causes the fluid to move on the surface in a

desired path. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in the specification as

originally filed, see *inter alia*, page 1, lines 28-31 and the figures 1-4 and 30-33. No new

matter is entered into the case by the amendment.

The apparatus taught and disclosed in Handique et al. comprises an enclosed

channel. The enclosed channel contains side walls which confine or limit the movement

of the fluid to a predefined path. Thus, the manipulator of Handique et al. is not devoid

of micro-channels as required by claim 1 of the present application. There is no teaching,

suggestion, or disclosure in Handique et al. of a surface for movement of fluid on the

surface in the absence of the micro-channels. In other words, applicants' invention is

complete and operational without micro-channels, whereas the Handique et al. apparatus

requires micro-channels for operability.

Application Serial No. 10/673,716

Filing Date: September 29, 2003

Docket No. 0830

Page 10 of 10

Since the Handique et al. reference fails to teach suggest or disclose, the invention

of claim 1 as amended that provides a microfluidic manipulator that that includes a

surface and thermal elements wherein the manipulator is devoid of micro-channels, claim

1 is not anticipated or obvious over Handique et al.

Claims 2-53 depend from claim 1 and provide additional important limitations.

Claims 2-53 are patentable over Handique et al. for the same reasons set forth above that

claim 1 is patentable over this reference. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request

that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) over Handique et al. be

reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of the pending claims

is earnestly requested. If the examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this

amendment, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed

below.

Respectfully submitted,

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P. C.

Rv

David E. LaRose

Registration No. 34,369

Agent for Applicants

P.O. Box 1871 Knoxville, TN 37901 Tel. 865-546-4305 Fax 865-523.4478